



CONTENT • CHARACTER • COMMUNITY

Imagine Southeast Public Charter School

INTEGRITY • JUSTICE • FUN

Title I Program Evaluation

During the previous school year, student data was analyzed by the leadership team, teachers and parents to determine the entire student need. Imagine Southeast Public Charter School operates a school-wide program and therefore Title I funds are utilized based on the overall academic need of the students.

Previously, a part of the Title I fund budget was allocated towards the following salaries: Math Specialist, Core Knowledge Coordinator, ELA Specialist, Early Childhood Literacy Coach, Reading Resource Teacher, 2 interventionist and an in-house tutor. At that time we felt that those positions were vital in the overall strive for proficiency.

Average Learning Gain (SAT 10)

Grade	N	Mean LG	Proportion Growth Expected
K	66	1.06	.65
1	99	1.02	.54
2	115	.93	.23
3	61	.99	.55
4	47	.97	.25
5	42	.98	.19
Overall	266	1.00	.45

➤ Overall 1 years growth

DC CAS Results

Subgroups	2012 DC CAS DATA							
	Math Tested 2012	Math Prof 2012	Math Target 2012	Met Math AMO 2012	Read Tested 2012	Read Prof 2012	Read Target 2012	Met Read AMO 2012
All Students	158	32.9%	38.6%	NO	158	36.7%	34.8%	YES
Race: BL7	156	32.1%	38.6%	NO	156	35.9%	34.8%	YES
Special Education	19	10.5%			19	10.5%		
ECODIS	148	33.1%	39.5%	NO	148	37.2%	35.0%	YES
All Students	72	62.5%	60.7%	YES	72	72.2%	66.0%	YES

DC CAS data shows that Imagine Southeast did not meet AMO for 2012 in the subgroups of African Americans and Economical disadvantage. In 2011 reading proficiency in the African American subgroup was 28.9%, it is currently 35.9%. In 2011 reading proficiency in the economically disadvantage subgroup was 29.1%, it is currently 37.2%. In 2011 math proficiency in the African American subgroup was 33.1%, it is currently 32.1%. In 2011 math proficiency in the economically disadvantage subgroup was 34.0%, it is currently 33.1%. Since Imagine Southeast did not make AMO in math for two years, we will implement a new math curriculum and appoint a lead in our “Pull-Out” instruction imitative to increase proficiency within the failing subgroups. The benefits of “Pull-Out” instruction include: more individualized attention to "targeted" students, less disruptive environment for the student and the instruction is aligned to what is being taught in the classroom

Based on an in-depth analysis of student data, there is still a severe need for interventions to increase math and reading proficiency. Imagine Southeast will develop several new support positions in SY13-14. Imagine Southeast will employ several co-teachers in testing grades to aide in achieving proficiency. The math curriculum, Math Expressions, is proven to be ineffective with our students. Imagine Southeast will change the math curriculum from Math Expressions to Progress in Math. Progress in Math is built around the Common Core Standards and will provide our students with an additional support component that will support our intervention goals for the deficits our students are displaying. Progress in Mathematics, now in its sixth decade of use-proven success, is a complete basal mathematics program. It is written by experienced teacher authors, it integrates a traditional course of study and today’s academic Standards with the most up-to date methods of teaching. Progress in Mathematics is designed to meet the individual needs of all learners. Progress in Math differs from Math Expressions

because it allows parents to track their child's progress at home thus increasing parental involvement.

The following assessment and recommendations have been developed after a review of the design of the literacy program, implementation of the program, consultation with special education and general education teachers across grade levels, and with the literacy coach by two of our team members.

1. Diagnostic Process to analyze root causes of performance issues for all students and subgroups of students:

- ☐ 100% of classroom teachers including both Special Education and General Education Teachers were observed utilizing a rubric for instructional practices that is aligned with Race to the Top Standards.
- ☐ 80% of classroom teachers presented a comprehensive portfolio of their approach to using assessments/data driven instruction
- ☐ Thorough review of materials and resources in school to support literacy instruction was conducted

2. Findings

- ☐ Nearly 100% of teachers utilize benchmark assessments to inform their instruction
- ☐ Approximately 90% of teachers rely upon school mandated assessments to define their approach to instruction (i.e. Dibels, MClass, A-Net)
- ☐ Formative assessment practices including exit tickets are used infrequently
- ☐ Formative assessment practices such as conferencing notes, checklists, rubrics, etc. are rarely utilized if at all
- ☐ Teachers discuss reading levels in a variety of ways and seem to rely on the Dibels measures of red, green, and yellow and on grade level, below grade level, and above grade level to describe reading proficiency
- ☐ There is no evidence of any cycles of assessments being conducted outside of interim measures like A-Net nor any alignment with intervention cycles/RTI, or UDL.
- ☐ Students do not have access to authentic reading materials and basals are heavily relied upon to support instruction
- ☐ Approximately 80-90 % of teacher's time reveals reliance on whole group instruction more small group work takes place in PK-K on a consistent basis

The continuum of services for Special Needs Students overemphasizes pull out services to the neglect of other service delivery models, limiting the opportunity for students to have access to content in the least restrictive environment

- ☐ 80% of Classroom teachers do not produce evidence of having the content knowledge necessary to support students with Special Needs in teaching Literacy or other content areas. Special needs students struggle with the one modality of assessment (namely a timed fluency reading measure (Dibels)
- ☐ The majority of students assessed are able to successfully decode text, but do not read fluently, or with stamina to complete texts of increasing length or text complexity required for proficient reading
- ☐ There is no systematic approach to looking at student work and driving lesson planning

utilizing results

- ☐ There is no systematic approach to engaging parents in the school's Literacy program
- ☐ There is no common language around reading strategies, genres, assessments, or goals outside of programmatic names (i.e. I use SAXON versus I teach phonemic awareness...) or I teach the skills from Houghton Mifflin versus I teach students to infer by...
- ☐ Behavior systems are inconsistent and teacher consistency is an issue from class to class
- ☐ Overall assessments are viewed as something that must be done "TO" children not something to do be done "WITH" them to assess their needs and teach them in a highly targeted manner for maximum impact

Recommendations:

Engage in a systematic introduction to the integration of independent reading in all classrooms and roll out components of a comprehensive and balanced approach to literacy instruction throughout the next 2 years

- ☐ Ensure that professional development focuses on teaching teachers to integrate the priorities for the ELA program with their assessment practices (as indicated in the chart)
- ☐ Ensure that all assessments and systems are functioning effectively before introducing the next component of guided reading which requires classrooms to be managed effectively so teachers can begin to substantially increase the use of small group, differentiated instruction
- ☐ Ensure that all PDS are integrating concepts from UDL, with protocols and structures for using student work to drive instruction
- ☐ Adopt a program with established operational systems for managing the tracking of assessments and multiple ways of aggregating data that also ensures the use of common language and efficiency in assessing individual student progress toward proficiency, reading practice, and increased outcomes on standardized measures